SEP 20 1974

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
9/17/74

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

When it takes six weeks to receive the kind of response your yesterday's letter provides to mine of August 9, I think the time has come to see whether or not it is possiblefm fof the courts to provide redress for these years of your stonewalling.

There are more substantial questions you have fobbed off in the past and have since I repeated them ignored entirely. I believe these involve substantial questions of fraud and I propose to explore this belief. Moreover, I believe this fraud was hurtful to me and had this intent and I shall discover if this is actionable.

As you should understand, there is nothing I would not prefer to going back to court again, particularly when it is just possible that a judge might look into an utterly unconscionable record that in my belief includes puerjury and its subornation.

You appear to have learned nothing from The Watergate except that when it was expedient you accepted for deposit the CREEP's files so they could be hidden by you.

Since the middle of June I have been seeking the answers to perfectly proper questions. You clearly have no intention of answering them voluntarily. You leave me no choice. Other than submitted to official dishonesties and corruption and that, please believe me, I will not do.

When my counsel has the time I will take these matters up with him.

However, you also have a record of deceiving, underinforming and misinforming the courts. So, in order that there will be a minimum opportunity for your Watergating with the courts, I request copies of all your ~~current~~ regulations, precedents, etc. controlling the availability of all Warren Commission materials as of the date the first responsibility the National Archives had for these records to the present. And in order that there cannot be another of these convenient oversights that are also so common, I want your personal assurance that what you ppovide is complete. My purpose ought not be a mystery. If I find that you have withheld any I will want to make that a matter of record before the court because you have also done this, too. As well as rewriting them ex poste facto.

The point I tried to make about charges is not frivolous. When I request copies at a time the rate is 10¢ per page and you delay providing them for whatever reason I believe you have the obligation to provide them at the rate pertaining at the time you refused the request. For me the difference is burdensome. There is also the principle. It is like a contract. I paid you in advance.

You have interposed every obstacle possible between me and the public information access to which is my right. One of these obstacles is extraordinary delay in making response — when it is made. Your copyyx of correspondence has recorded on it the time by which response is to be made. If there are regulations that are applicable, I would like a copy. I would like the notation customarily attached indicating when my letter of August 9 should have been answered. If it is fully responsive, there is no apparent reason for a delay of six weeks.

Unless there is what either has not been reported or what I do not recall, there is no current general declassification underway. I therefore ask the occasion for this seemingly not ordinary declassification. If my recollection is correct, for each withholding you have a sheet indicating the authority and the reason. I therefore renew the request as it is applicable to this. Please send me the CDs referrred to in this correspondence and both versions of the one in which a single sentence was withheld. Use up the minimum charge by providing me duplicate copies to the limit of the minimum. If there is correspondence on this declassification, please send me all copies prior to using up the minimum charge.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg